

REMARKS

Claims 3, 4, 13-16 and 21-26 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 3, 4 and 13-16 are amended, claims 21-26 are added, and claims 8, 11 and 17-20 are canceled. Reconsideration of the present application based on the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

I. Priority Document

The Office Action asserts that the Applicants need to submit a certified translated copy of the foreign priority document in order to perfect the claimed foreign priority. Applicants have submitted to the Patent Office, and the Patent Office has acknowledged receipt of, the certified copy of the Priority Document. Applicants choose not to perfect the claim for priority by submitting a translation at this time, because Applicants do not at this time rely on the priority date to disqualify a reference as prior art under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) or §102(a). If the Examiner is withholding application of a reference based on the belief that the reference will be disqualified by the perfected priority claim, the Examiner is requested to cite the reference and explain how it relates to Applicants' claims.

II. Claim Rejections

The Office Action rejects claims 3, 4, 8 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,796,951 to Hamner (hereinafter "Hamner") in view of Mastering Windows NT Server 4, fifth edition, 1998 to Minasi (hereinafter "Minasi") and further in view of Using Windows 95, Special Edition, 1995 to Person (hereinafter "Person"); claims 13 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamner, in view of Minasi, Person, and U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0552995 to Idehara (hereinafter "Idehara") and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,414,809 to Hogan (hereinafter "Hogan"); claims 15-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamner, Minasi and Person and further in view of Idehara. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

None of the applied art discloses:

A device retrieving apparatus that retrieves a device mapped to a desired person among a plurality of devices present on a network, said device retrieving apparatus comprising:

- an application unit, said application unit causing individual symbols corresponding to individuals and device symbols corresponding to devices to be displayed on the screen of said display unit,
- said application unit, when an instruction is given externally via said input unit to map a desired first device symbol among the device symbols displayed on the screen to a specific individual symbol corresponding to the desired person,
- specifying an individual description of the desired person corresponding to the mapped individual symbol as a specific individual description,
- gaining access to a database that is present in a server connected to the network, obtaining a device description mapped to the specific individual description out of mapping information, which is stored in said database and regards mapping of a plurality of individual descriptions to device descriptions expressing said plurality of devices present on the network, and
- causing at least one of the obtained device description and a second device symbol representing a device expressed by the obtained device description to be displayed on the screen of said display unit, as claimed in claim 3; or

A device retrieving apparatus that retrieves a device mapped to a desired person among a plurality of devices present on a network, said device retrieving apparatus comprising:

- a control unit, said control unit causing individual symbols corresponding to individuals and device symbols corresponding to devices to be displayed on the screen of said display unit,
- said control unit, when an instruction is given externally via said input unit to map a desired first device symbol among the device symbols displayed on the screen to a specific individual symbol corresponding to the desired person,
- specifying an individual description of the desired person corresponding to the mapped individual symbol as a specific individual description,
- gaining access to a database that is present in an apparatus connected to the network or in said device retrieving apparatus,
- obtaining a device description mapped to the specific individual description out of mapping information, which is stored in said database and regards mapping of a plurality of individual descriptions to device descriptions expressing said plurality of devices present on the network, and
- causing at least one of the obtained device description and a second device symbol representing a device expressed by the obtained device description to be displayed on the screen of said display unit, as claimed in claim 21.

Hamner discloses a view display 200 for a typical network including a device window 201 and a task window 202; that devices and device groups in the network are represented in the device window 201; that each group and each device is represented with its name and a bitmap (icon); and that double-clicking on a group bitmap with a cursor control device will cause the group to be expanded to a tree hierarchy consisting of all the devices within the group, e.g., "Guest" 206 and "User 1" 210 are displayed descending from "PC" 205 because those devices are members of the "PC" group (col. 4, lines 1-32; Fig. 2a). Minasi discloses

that to view and manage the properties of a displayed user account or group, simply double-click on the name of the account or group (page 349, lines 19-22). The Office Action asserts that Minasi teaches of person symbols and person information at page 349; however, this information is not disclosed on page 349 or, in fact, any other part of the Minasi reference. Person discloses that there are various ways that the drag-and-drop method can be used to save time, e.g., moving and copying files and folders, and transferring files from one application to another, e.g., a table from a spreadsheet into a word processing document (page 107, first paragraph).

The Office Action asserts that:

Minasi's use of individual person symbol and person information would facilitate identifying individual person symbol and correspondingly manage the information each individual person. The users would be able to easily identify their respective symbols and would help them manage their own personal settings. Person's use of dragging a symbol and dropping it on another symbol would facilitate an easy and faster mapping of user symbol the device symbol including execution of the target functionality that also help obtaining a device description mapped to a particular user description for the mapped icon. Dragging a device symbol on the user's symbol or the window containing the user's personal settings would be an easier way of mapping a device to the desired user, as suggested by Person. Therefore, combined teachings of Hamner, Minasi and Person meet the claimed limitation. (Page 6, lines 12-23).

In this case, (1) the applied references fail to disclose all of the features of the claims, and (2) assuming all of the features of the claims are disclosed in the applied art, the motivation put forth in the Office Action is inadequate to combine Person and Minasi with Hamner. A *prima facie* case of obviousness requires that the prior art references provide a suggestion or motivation for one skilled in the art to combine or modify the prior art to create the Applicants' invention with reasonable expectation of success. Moreover, determinations

of obviousness must only take into account knowledge that was commensurate with the ordinary level of skill in the art at the time the invention was made. See MPEP §2145.

First, as discussed above, the Office Action admits that Hamner fails to disclose individual persons corresponding to persons and individual information corresponding to the selected persons; however, the Office Action asserts that because Minasi discloses that to view and manage the properties of a displayed user account, simply double-click on the name of the account (page 349, lines 19-22), Minasi teaches of person's symbols and person information. The Office Action's reasoning is incorrect because the above reference to Minasi only discloses the name of the account and a way of viewing and managing the properties of the account. A display according to Minasi would show no correlation between devices and users.

Second, even assuming all of the features of the claims were disclosed in the applied art, the motivation put forth in the Office Action to combine Person and Minasi with Hamner is inadequate. The Office Action appears to assert that it is proper to combine Hamner, Minasi and Person so that users can "easily identify the device symbols and device descriptions mapped to their individual symbol as well as manage their own personal settings." However, in Hamner, a user can manage device symbols by using the device window 201 and task window 202, and thus, in Hamner a user can already easily manage their own settings without mapping a device symbol to an individual symbol.

Applicants respectfully submit that only the present application suggests the claimed combination of features. As such, the asserted combination of Hammer, Minasi and Person was made using improper hindsight reconstruction of the references.

* * * * *

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the applied art fails to anticipate or render obvious the features of claims 3 or 21. Furthermore, those claims which depend from

claims 3 and 21 are likewise distinguishable over the applied art for at least the reasons discussed above, as well as for additional features they recite. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Jude L. Cooney
Registration No. 54,045

JAO:JLC/ldg

Attachments:

Request for Continued Examination
Petition for Extension of Time
Information Disclosure Statement

Date: January 31, 2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
--